

REMARKS

Claims 5-8, 12, 13, 18 and 20-24 are pending in the present application. With entry of this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 8 and 18. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beigi (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,187). The present application is a divisional of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,946 (filed on April 24, 2001) and claims priority to a Japanese application filed on April 25, 2000. Beigi was filed on January 5, 2001, which is after the filing date of the Japanese priority application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.55(a), Applicant submits herewith a translation of the Japanese priority application.

The Examiner rejected claims 12, 18 and 20-24 under § 102(a) as being anticipated by Onishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,720). The Examiner has informed us that the rejection also includes claim 8. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a word composing apparatus. It can be used, for example, to compose lyrics for a melody. The apparatus employs "sentence syntax templates." A template is a sentence structure that defines the order of parts of speech. For example, Fig. 14 illustrates a number of different sentence structures, such as subject (S) + verb (V) or subject (S) + verb (V) + object (O). The apparatus can pair a segment of a melody to one of these structures or templates to aid in composing words to the melody. (*See, e.g.*, specification at page 19, line 5 to page 21, line 16.)

Claim 8 is directed to the storage, display and designation of a "sentence syntax template." It recites a "sentence syntax storing device storing a plurality of sentence syntax templates each defining a typical order of a plurality of parts of speech" and a "display unit that displays a plurality of sentence syntax templates, based on the stored sentence syntax templates, to

urge selection of one sentence syntax template.” It further recites a “designator that designates one sentence syntax template among sentence syntax templates displayed on said display unit.”

In contrast, Onishi fails to disclose the storage, display and designation of a “sentence syntax template.” Onishi discloses an apparatus for translating a conversational sentence. The user inputs a conversational sentence in a first language, *e.g.*, Japanese, into the apparatus. (*See, e.g.*, Col. 16 lines 38-60.) The apparatus then extracts semantic features – such as a noun, verb, etc. – from the sentence. (Col. 16, lines 42-45; *see also* Col. 17, lines 3-7.) Based on the extracted semantic features, the apparatus selects the most appropriate sentence in Japanese and in another language, *e.g.*, English, and displays both of them. Thus, Onishi is not directed at all to the apparatus of claim 8. As discussed above, claim 8 recites the storage and display of different sentence syntax templates – *i.e.*, different sentence structures – and the designation of a given sentence structure to aid in composing words. No such templates are even disclosed in Onishi.

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner cites the abstract of Onishi as disclosing sentence syntax templates. The abstract refers to a “semantic feature dictionary” that stores “names of semantic features and character strings in a first language.” However, this dictionary merely obtains the appropriate semantic feature for an expression extracted from the conversational sentence. This is evident from Fig. 2 of Onishi and the discussion at Col. 17, lines 3-35. For example, if the conversational sentence includes any expression with the string “nega” – *e.g.*, “onegai shimasu” and “onegai shitai” as illustrated in Fig. 2 – then the dictionary provides the appropriate semantic feature or word, *i.e.*, “onegai.” (*See also* Col. 17, lines 3-35.) There is no disclosure or suggestion in the abstract of storing different sentence syntax templates as recited in claim 8.

The abstract further notes that a bilingual database stores “various conversational sentence examples.” This refers to storing sentences, such as “could you tell me how to get to the hotel,” in different languages as illustrated in Fig. 3 of Onishi. Such sentences follow a grammatical structure in order to be proper. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the abstract of storing the actual sentence structures, such as “subject + verb + object,” upon which such sentences are formed.

The Examiner also refers to Onishi as disclosing a display unit 4 in Fig. 1 that displays “sentence syntax templates” for selection. (*See* Office Action, at page 3.) As discussed above, the user in Onishi merely inputs a conversational sentence, and the proper sentence in two languages is displayed. There is no disclosure of displaying sentence syntax templates for selection. To the contrary, Onishi emphasizes allowing the user to be free from any selections by freely inputting conversational sentences as desired. (Col. 20, lines 28-31.) Indeed, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out where Onishi discloses sentence syntax templates and their display.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 is not anticipated by Onishi.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 22-24 are not anticipated by Onishi for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

The Examiner rejected claims 20 and 21 based on Onishi, but he did not reject claim 13 from which claims 20 and 21 depend. Claim 13 recites “selecting a sentence syntax template from a plurality of sentence syntax templates each defining a typical order of a plurality of parts of speech.” As discussed above, Onishi does not disclose selecting a sentence syntax template and thus does not anticipate claim 13 or its dependent claims 20 and 21.

Finally, claim 12 is directed to a word composing method. The method comprises “designating at least a part of speech as a search condition” and “search a word matching the search condition from a dictionary. . . .” For example, Fig. 10B of the present application shows the user designating a “noun” as a search condition. Fig. 10B shows that the other parts of speech, such as pronoun, verb and adjective, can also be designated as search conditions.

In contrast, Onishi fails to disclose designating a “part of speech” as a search condition for searching a dictionary. As discussed above, Onishi discloses that a user inputs a conversational sentence which is then analyzed by the apparatus. The analysis includes the use of a dictionary, but the search is based on the words in the conversational sentence as described above. The search is

not based on designating a “noun” or other part of speech. The Examiner cites to Col. 35, lines 18-22 as disclosing the recited designation, but the cited section simply refers to a display device. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out where Onishi discloses the recited designation.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is not anticipated by Onishi.

Claim 18 recites “designating at least a part of speech as a search condition” and “searching a word matching the search condition from a dictionary.” Thus, it is not anticipated by Onishi for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032024510.

Dated: March 6, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mehran Arjomand

Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200